UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/929,888	08/15/2001	Takehiko Nakano	SONYJP 3.0-199	9309

530 7590 03/17/2006

LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,
KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK
600 SOUTH AVENUE WEST
WESTFIELD, NJ 07090

EXAMINER	
BATURAY, ALICIA	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2155	

DATE MAILED: 03/17/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/929,888	NAKANO ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Alicia Baturay	2155	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *17 January 2006*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-19* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-19* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *15 August 2001* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *07022004*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is in response to a request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), which was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 17 January 2006 has been entered.

2. Claims 1, 10 and 11 were amended.

3. Claims 1-19 are pending in this Office Action.

Response to Amendment

4. Applicant's amendments and arguments with respect to claims 1-19 filed on 17 January 2006 have been fully considered but they are deemed to be moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Specification

5. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1, 2, 4-11 and 13-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Croy et al. (U.S. 6,476,825) and in further view of Yamanaka et al. (U.S. 6,292,226).

Croy teaches the invention substantially as claimed including a control device for controlling and monitoring an electronic device capable of reproducing video programming.

8. With respect to claim 1, Croy teaches a method of controlling an information processing apparatus connected to a plurality of control devices over a network the method comprising:

Selecting, at a given one of the plurality of control devices, a specific one of a plurality of controlled hardware portions of the information processing apparatus; and controlling the associated portion of the information processing apparatus based on the control request (Croy, col. 17, lines 32-47).

Croy does not explicitly teach the use of multiple control devices or a correspondence table.

However, Yamanaka teaches transmitting, from the given one of the plurality of control devices to the information processing apparatus over the network, an identification number

corresponding to the selected one of the plurality of controlled hardware portions and identification information corresponding to the given one of the plurality of control devices (Yamanaka, col. 9, line 57 – col. 10, line 9); storing the identification number corresponding to the selected one of the plurality of controlled hardware portions and the identification information corresponding to the given one of the plurality of control devices in a control correspondence table of the information processing apparatus such that the identification number corresponding to the selected one of the plurality of controlled hardware portions is associated with the identification information corresponding to the given one of the plurality of control devices (Yamanaka, Fig. 6; col. 10, lines 20-36); repeating the selecting step, the transmitting step and the storing step to associate the identification information corresponding to a further one of the plurality of control devices with the identification number corresponding to a further one of the plurality of controlled hardware portions (Yamanaka, Fig. 3; col. 7, line 64 – col. 8, line 9); transmitting a control request from the given one of the plurality of control devices or from the further one of the plurality of control devices to the information processing apparatus over the network, the control request including the identification information corresponding to the transmitting control device; and referring to the control correspondence table to obtain the identification number corresponding to the controlled hardware portion of the information processing apparatus that is associated with the identification information corresponding to the transmitting control device (Yamanaka, Fig. 6; col. 10, lines 20-36).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Croy in view of Yamanaka in order to enable the use of multiple control

devices and a correspondence table. One would be motivated to do so in order to allow for different user interfaces for different users.

9. With respect to claim 2, Croy teaches the invention described in claim 1, including the method where the given one of the plurality of control devices and the further one of the plurality of control devices each transmit to the information processing apparatus through an IEEE 1394 digital interface (Croy, col. 4, lines 38-47).

10. With respect to claim 4, Croy teaches the invention described in claim 1, including the method where the associated portion of the information processing apparatus is operable to reproduce software information recorded on a digital versatile disc (Croy, col. 20, line 59 – col. 21, line 4).

11. With respect to claim 5, Croy teaches the invention described in claim 1, including the method where the given one of the plurality of control devices and the further one of the plurality of control devices each transmit to the information processing apparatus through a wireless communication interface (Croy, col. 4, lines 32-34).

12. With respect to claim 6, Croy teaches the invention described in claim 5, including the method where wireless communication is carried out using the Bluetooth communication standard (Croy, col. 26, lines 37-42).

13. With respect to claim 7, Croy teaches the invention described in claim 5, including the method where wireless communication is carried out over infra-red wavelength (Croy, col. 4, lines 32-34).

14. With respect to claim 8, Croy teaches the invention described in claim 1, including the method where the associated portion of the information processing apparatus is operable to reproduce audio visual information recorded on a hard disc (Croy, col. 20, line 59 – col. 21, line 4).

15. With respect to claim 9, Croy teaches the invention described in claim 1, including the method where at least one of the given control device and the further control device is a digital television receiver (Croy, col. 21,lines 7-10).

16. Claims 3 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Croy in view of Yamanaka and in further view of Humpleman et al. (U.S. 6,466,971).

Croy teaches the invention substantially as claimed including a control device for controlling and monitoring an electronic device capable of reproducing video programming.

17. With respect to claim 3, Croy teaches the invention described in claim 1, a method of controlling an information processing apparatus connected to a plurality of control devices over a network the method comprising:

Selecting, at a given one of the plurality of control devices, a specific one of a plurality of controlled hardware portions of the information processing apparatus; and controlling the associated portion of the information processing apparatus based on the control request (Croy, col. 17, lines 32-47).

Croy does not explicitly teach the use of multiple control devices or a correspondence table.

However, Yamanaka teaches transmitting, from the given one of the plurality of control devices to the information processing apparatus over the network, an identification number corresponding to the selected one of the plurality of controlled hardware portions and identification information corresponding to the given one of the plurality of control devices (Yamanaka, col. 9, line 57 – col. 10, line 9); storing the identification number corresponding to the selected one of the plurality of controlled hardware portions and the identification information corresponding to the given one of the plurality of control devices in a control correspondence table of the information processing apparatus such that the identification number corresponding to the selected one of the plurality of controlled hardware portions is associated with the identification information corresponding to the given one of the plurality of control devices (Yamanaka, Fig. 6; col. 10, lines 20-36); repeating the selecting step, the transmitting step and the storing step to associate the identification information corresponding to a further one of the plurality of control devices with the identification

number corresponding to a further one of the plurality of controlled hardware portions (Yamanaka, Fig. 3; col. 7, line 64 – col. 8, line 9); transmitting a control request from the given one of the plurality of control devices or from the further one of the plurality of control devices to the information processing apparatus over the network, the control request including the identification information corresponding to the transmitting control device; and referring to the control correspondence table to obtain the identification number corresponding to the controlled hardware portion of the information processing apparatus that is associated with the identification information corresponding to the transmitting control device (Yamanaka, Fig. 6; col. 10, lines 20-36).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Croy in view of Yamanaka in order to enable the use of multiple control devices and a correspondence table. One would be motivated to do so in order to allow for different user interfaces for different users.

The combination of Croy and Yamanaka does explicitly teach the use of an AV/C Panel Subunit Model and Command Set.

However, Humpleman teaches the method where the selecting step includes sending a first pass-through command to the information processing apparatus from the given one of the plurality of control devices or from the further one of the plurality of control devices, and the controlling step includes sending a second pass-through command to the information processing apparatus from the given one of the plurality of control devices or from the further one of the plurality of control devices, the first and second pass-through commands

being respectively chosen from an AV/C Panel Subunit Model and Command Set (Humpleman, col. 11, lines 42-48).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Croy and Yamanaka in view of Humpleman in order to enable the use of an AV/C Panel Subunit Model and Command Set. One would be motivated to do so in order to allow for the use of a standardized command set.

18. With respect to claim 12, Croy teaches the invention described in claim 1, including a method of controlling an information processing apparatus connected to a plurality of control devices over a network the method comprising:

Selecting, at a given one of the plurality of control devices, a specific one of a plurality of controlled hardware portions of the information processing apparatus; and controlling the associated portion of the information processing apparatus based on the control request (Croy, col. 17, lines 32-47).

Croy does not explicitly teach the use of multiple control devices or a correspondence table.

However, Yamanaka teaches transmitting, from the given one of the plurality of control devices to the information processing apparatus over the network, an identification number corresponding to the selected one of the plurality of controlled hardware portions and identification information corresponding to the given one of the plurality of control devices (Yamanaka, col. 9, line 57 – col. 10, line 9); storing the identification number corresponding to the selected one of the plurality of controlled hardware portions and the identification

information corresponding to the given one of the plurality of control devices in a control correspondence table of the information processing apparatus such that the identification number corresponding to the selected one of the plurality of controlled hardware portions is associated with the identification information corresponding to the given one of the plurality of control devices (Yamanaka, Fig. 6; col. 10, lines 20-36); repeating the selecting step, the transmitting step and the storing step to associate the identification information corresponding to a further one of the plurality of control devices with the identification number corresponding to a further one of the plurality of controlled hardware portions (Yamanaka, Fig. 3; col. 7, line 64 – col. 8, line 9); transmitting a control request from the given one of the plurality of control devices or from the further one of the plurality of control devices to the information processing apparatus over the network, the control request including the identification information corresponding to the transmitting control device; and referring to the control correspondence table to obtain the identification number corresponding to the controlled hardware portion of the information processing apparatus that is associated with the identification information corresponding to the transmitting control device (Yamanaka, Fig. 6; col. 10, lines 20-36).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Croy in view of Yamanaka in order to enable the use of multiple control devices and a correspondence table. One would be motivated to do so in order to allow for different user interfaces for different users.

The combination of Croy and Yamanaka does explicitly teach the use of sending the correspondence table from one apparatus to another.

However, Humpleman teaches the method further comprising transmitting the control correspondence table from the information processing apparatus to at least another information processing apparatus over the network (Humpleman, col. 8, lines 56-63).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Croy and Yamanaka in view of Humpleman in order to enable sending the correspondence table from one apparatus to another. One would be motivated to do so in order to enable sending an entire table of associations between devices and portions rather than each association individually.

19. Claims 10, 11 and 13-19 do not teach or define any new limitations above claims 1-9 and 12 and therefore are rejected for similar reasons.

Response to Arguments

20. Applicant's arguments filed 17 January 2006 have been fully considered, but they are not persuasive for the reasons set forth below.

21. Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alicia Baturay whose telephone number is (571) 272-3981. The examiner can normally be reached at 7:30am - 5pm, Monday - Thursday, and every other Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Saleh Najjar can be reached on (571) 272-4006. The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Alicia Baturay
March 13, 2006

SALEH NAJJAR
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER